



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,881	06/28/2001	Morten Meldal	030307/0198	9838

22428 7590 11/29/2005  
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

RAHMANI, NILOOFAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
09/787,881	MELDAL ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Niloofar Rahmani	1625	

**Status of Application:** *pending*

(3) Margaret D. Seaman.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time: 9:30 AM**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

## Part I.

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

**Claims discussed:**

**10-14, 28-32, 34**

**Prior art documents discussed:**

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

**See Continuation Sheet**

### Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

~~D. MARGARET SEAMAN~~  
~~PRIMARY EXAMINER.~~

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Telephone call was made on 11/21/2005 with the attorney Vidmoham'ram. The attorney wanted the examiner to check the status of claim 10 with William R. Dixon. The examiner informed the applicants that claims 11 and 12 are improper multiple dependent claims. The rejection of record for PEG of claims 12-14, 28-32 and the duplicate claim for 34 were discussed.